



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,522	05/20/2002	Juergen Heymann	07781.0042	4073

32864 7590 06/16/2005
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C.
PO BOX 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

BHATIA, AJAY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2145

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/049,522

Applicant(s)

HEYMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Ajay M. Bhatia

Art Unit

2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/13/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
2. The spacing of the lines of the specification is such as to make reading difficult. New application papers with lines 1½ or double spaced on good quality paper are required.
3. Claims 1-19 are objected to because of the following informalities: line space. Appropriate correction is required.
4. The claims are objected to because the lines are crowded too closely together, making reading difficult. Substitute claims with lines one and one-half or double spaced on good quality paper are required. See 37 CFR 1.52(b).

Claim Objections

5. Claims 1-19 are objected to because of the following informalities: some characters enclosed in the parenthesis do not relate to that feature. Appropriate correction is required.

Reference characters corresponding to elements recited in the detailed description of the drawings and used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims. See MPEP § 608.01(m).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "script (1-5)" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 8-11 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claimed invention in the use of the term "A computer program product" fail to limit the claim to tangible embodiments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Art Unit: 2145

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brandt (U.S. Patent 5,892,905).

10. For claim 1, Brandt teaches, a method (500) for communication between a client computer (900) and a server computer (901), both computers (900, 901) using the hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP), the client computer (900) using an HTTP-browser (210);

the method (500) comprising the following steps:

sending (520) a first request (230) from the client computer (900) to the server computer (901);

upon receiving (530) the first request (230), the server computer (901), (i) allocating (531) a resource (340) at the server computer (901), the resource (340) with

an identifier (350), and (ii) returning (532) a predetermined close instruction (360) to the browser (210), the close instruction (360) carrying the identifier (350);

upon unloading (540) the close instruction (360) from the browser (210) of the client computer (900), sending (560) a second request (240) from the client computer (900) to the server computer (901), the second request (240) carrying the identifier (350) and indicating to de-allocate the resource (340); and

upon receiving (570) the second request (240) from the client computer (900), by the server computer (901) de-allocating (580) the resource (340). (de-allocation is interpreted as deleting, removing from use temporally or permanently, re-assigning, or temporally removing the use of) (see Brandt, Col. 5 lines 5-67, Col. 8 lines 31-39, Col. 11 lines 15-24, Col. 17 lines 6-24)

11. For claim 2, Brandt teaches, the method (500) of claim 1, wherein after the server computer (901) has returned (532) the predetermined close instruction (360), and before the server computer (901) receives (570) the second request (240) from the client computer (900), the server computer (901) consecutively sends content pages (335) to the client computer (900). (see Brandt, Col. 17 lines 25-45)

12. For claim 3, Brandt teaches, the method (500) of claim 2, wherein in the step returning (532) a predetermined close instruction (360), the browser (210) presents the close instruction (360) in a first frame (215) and presents the content pages (335) in a

Art Unit: 2145

second frame (216). (see Brandt, Col. 18 lines 38-45, it is inherent feature of a browser to display content in any of a multiple frames)

13. For claim 4, Brandt teaches, the method (500) of claim 2, wherein the close instruction (360) prevents selected content pages (335) from being cached by the browser (210). (see Brandt, Col. 18 lines 38-45, a inherent feature of purging cached files is nothing is able to be cached)

14. For claim 5, Brandt teaches, the method (500) of claim 1, wherein in the step sending (560) a second request (240), the client computer (900) sends the second request (240) to a predetermined address of the server computer (901). (see Brandt, Col. 7 lines 55-60, it is necessary to know the address of a device to communicate with it in a network)

15. For claim 6, Brandt teaches, the method (500) of claim 1, wherein in the step returning (532) a predetermined close instruction, the predetermined close instruction (360) comprises script (1-5). (see Brandt, Col. 28 lines 33-56)

16. For claim 7, Brandt teaches, the method (500) of claim 1, wherein in the step returning (532) a predetermined close instruction, the script does not lead to a presentation by the browser (210). (see Brandt, Col. 18 lines 38-45, close of an applicant inherently prevents communication with the application and display of any

Art Unit: 2145

information)

17. Claims 8-16 list all the same elements of claims 1-7, but in product, medium and system form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 1-7 applies equally as well to claims 8-16.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

18. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

19. Claims 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt in view of Special Edition Using Windows with 95 Internet Explorer 4.0 (referred to as Windows).

20. For claim 17, Brandt teaches, a method (600) for communication between a client computer (900) and a server computer (901), both computers (900, 901) using the hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP), the client computer (900) using an HTTP-browser (210);

the method (600) comprising the following steps:

sending (601) a request (230) from the client computer (900) to the server computer (901);

upon receiving (611) the request (230), the server computer (901):

allocating (612) a resource at the server computer (901), the resource with an identifier (350), returning (613) a close instruction (360) to the client computer (900), the close instruction (360) and the identifier (350),

upon receiving (602) the close instruction (360), the client computer (900) (see Brandt, Col. 5 lines 5-67, Col. 8 lines 31-39, Col. 11 lines 15-24, Col. 17 lines 6-24)

Brandt fails to clearly disclose, time-out period (T), with the time-out period (T), measuring (614) the time (t) during that communication between the client computer (900) and the server computer (901) is idle, and de-allocating (615) the resource (340) when the measured time (t) reaches the time-out period (T); and measuring (603) the time (t) during that the communication between the client computer (900) and the server computer (901) is idle, displaying (604) a warning to the user if the measured time (t) reaches a predetermined fraction ($\lceil \text{fraction}(T/X) \rceil$) of the time-out period (T).

Windows teaches, time-out period (T), with the time-out period (T), measuring (614) the time (t) during that communication between the client computer (900) and the server computer (901) is idle, and de-allocating (615) the resource (340) when the measured time (t) reaches the time-out period (T); and measuring (603) the time (t) during that the communication between the client computer (900) and the server computer (901) is idle,

Art Unit: 2145

displaying (604) a warning to the user if the measured time (t) reaches a predetermined fraction ($\frac{T}{X}$) of the time-out period (T). ($\frac{T}{X}$ is defined as anytime before the connection fully times-out a de-allocation takes place) (see Windows, see cited page from chapter 17)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the system of Brandt and the Window's method of giving a warning and disconnecting, because it is well known in the art at the time of the invention that using features that integrate of the Operating System reduces the amount of development and design to create system that operate on that operating system. (see Brandt, Col. 1 lines 45-56 and Col. 3 lines 35-40)

Claim '18 list all the same elements of claim 17, but in system form rather than method form. Therefore, the supporting rationale of the rejection to claim 17 applies equally as well to claim 18

For claim 19, Brandt-Windows teaches, a method (700) for communication between a client computer (900) and a server computer (901), both computers (900, 901) using the hypertext transfer protocol (HTTP), the client computer (900) using an HTTP-browser (210);

the method (700) comprising the following steps:

Art Unit: 2145

sending (720) a first request (230) from the client computer (900) to the server computer (901);

allocating (731) a resource (340) at the server computer (901), the resource (340) with an identifier (350);

returning (732) a predetermined response page to the browser (210), the response page carrying the identifier (350) and carrying browser instructions;

as instructed by the response page, periodically sending (760) the second requests (240) by the browser (210) to the server computer (901), the second requests (240) carrying the identifier (350); and

at the server computer (901), periodically checking (770) the arrival of the second requests (240) with the identifier (350) from the client computer (900) and de-allocating (780) the resource (340) in case a predetermined time period (T) has lapsed since the last arrival. (see Brandt, Col. 5 lines 5-67, Col. 8 lines 31-39, Col. 11 lines 15-24, Col. 17 lines 6-24) and (see Windows, see cited page from chapter 17) The same motivation that was utilized in the rejection of claim 17, applies equally as well to claim 19.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached UPSTO 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ajay M Bhatia whose telephone number is (571)-272-3906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Valencia M Wallace can be reached on (571)-272-6159. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AB


VALENCIA MARTIN-WALLACE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER